REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Shiraishi, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,809,724). Claims 2 through 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraishi in view of Hinckley, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,690,365). Additional prior art is made of record but not relied upon in the present action.

Independent claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended to more clearly set forth Applicant's patentable subject matter and to more clearly distinguish Applicant's claimed invention from the prior art. Claim 2 has been canceled in favor of the amendment to claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended to shift its dependency from canceled claim 2 to amended claim 1. Claims 4 and 6 remain as originally presented. Claim 7 has been amended to shift its dependency from canceled claim 2 to amended claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

Applicant's amendments of independent claims 1, 5 and 8 are generally similar in that the amended claims now more clearly set forth Applicant's inventive combination with particular attention to the pen-based computer interface system which is capable of shifting between a write mode and a pan mode through the actuation of a single controlling button. As is described below in greater detail, this amendment of claims 1, 5 and 8 more clearly sets forth the advantages of the present invention system which facilitate continuous actions of writing, panning to create

writing space, and continuation of writing without the need to lift the pen from the LCD writing screen.

U.S. Patent 6,809,724 issued to Shiraishi, et al. (herein "Shiraishi") sets forth a device of the type generally described as a personal digital assistant or PDA suitable for being worn upon the user's wrist. Thus, the device of Shiraishi is necessarily small in size and utilizes a multipurpose LCD display. A plurality of actuatable buttons or inputs are positioned about the periphery of the device housing. The display screen is controlled based upon an operational input given by operation of the input of the device which includes a rotational operating unit having an axis of rotation extending in predefined directions. The rotational operating unit is arranged such that a rotational operation of the unit in a physical sense causes a corresponding rotation of the display axis.

U.S. Patent 6,690,365 issued to Hinckley, et al. (hereinafter "Hinckley") sets forth an automatic scrolling device for a computer which utilizes a touch sensitive surface and which may have a single or multiple active region operation. Scrolling is performed in manual as well as automated operation. The device implements various automatic scrolling functions controlled by the positioning of the user's finger (or other pointer) for a threshold amount of time. The speed of automatic scrolling is determined by finger pressure and/or other factors. Various modes of automatic scrolling operation are provided in response to finger or pointer touch upon the display. The system shown in Hinckley is an automatic scrolling system and is not a system which utilizes a "write mode".

At the outset, Examiner's attention is invited to the aspects of the present invention which are extremely important to the advantages and utility of the present invention system. Thus, it must be remembered that the present invention system is a pen-based computer system in which the user is able to write upon a display screen with a stylus or pen. The present invention further utilizes the operation of a pan mode again in response to pen movement upon the display screen to move the displayed portion of written material viewed through the limited area of the displayed screen to positions which provide additional writing space. The inventive system facilitates the continued operations of writing and panning and continuation of writing without the need for lifting or moving the pen from its current position on the document being written or drawn or otherwise imparted to the displayed image. It should also be emphasized that neither Shiraishi nor Hinckley present systems which operate in this manner or which are operative in this environment. Simply stated, neither Shiraishi nor Hinckley are pen-based writing systems for operation upon a display screen. This is a particular environment within which many of the currently produced computer devices of the type referred to in Applicant's background function.

Examiner repeatedly states in rejecting Applicant's claims that Shiraishi and Hinckley teach a write mode. In fact, careful examination of the disclosures of Hinckley and Shiraishi reveal that neither utilizes a pen-based on screen writing operation or mode which is at all similar to that in the environment and the inventive aspects of the present invention system. For example, at page 4 of the present office action relating to rejection of claim 4 that "Hinckley teaches the write mode is selected when said button is open and said pan mode is selected when said button is pressed and closed" referring to column 12, lines 47 through 56 of Hinckley.

However, examination of the cited portion of Hinckley reveals that this statement is incorrect. In fact, the cited portion of Hinckley refers to absolute scrolling or some other mode of operation by pressing a key or button spaced proximate to the touch sensitive surface of the scrolling device or a key pad. In fact, no mention is made of either write or pan modes much less transferring between such modes. Similarly, at page 5 of the present office action relating to Examiner's rejection of claim 5, Examiner concedes that Shiraishi does not teach that the pen is moved upon the display screen and for a panning screen image in response to pen movement of the pen upon the screen. Examiner then states however Hinckley teaches the pen is moved upon the display screen for panning the image. Examiner further states that Hinckley sets forth at column 14, lines 63 through 65 that Hinckley includes means for causing the processor to implement writing in response to a button being activated or non-activated and further that means are provided for the processor to implement panning in response to button activation again referring to column 14, lines 63 through 65 of Hinckley. However, careful review of the cited passage of Hinckley (column 14, lines 63 through 65) reveals that the system is concerned with auto scrolling and that different amounts of contact between the user's finger and the auto scrolling up regions and auto scrolling down regions produces certain operation. No reference is made in the indicated portion of Hinckley, or elsewhere for that matter, of any operation which is akin to Applicant's inventive system. This incorrect view of Hinckley's teaching continues at page 5 of the present office action relating to Examiner's rejection of claim 6 in which Examiner states that Shiraishi does not teach the pan mode being selected when the button is open and the write mode selected when the button is pressed and closed. However, Examiner contends Hinckley teaches the pan mode is selected when the button is open and the write mode is selected when the button is pressed and

closed reference being made to column 12, lines 47 through 56 of Hinckley. Once again, careful review of this portion of Hinckley reveals that no disclosure of a pan mode and write mode is made yet alone disclosure of mode selection by pressing a single button. This same incorrect interpretation of Shiraishi and Hinckley continues throughout the remainder of the present office action. For example, at page 6 relating to Examiner's rejection of claim 8, Examiner again states that Shiraishi does not teach that the pen is moved upon the display screen and a writing process is implemented in response to the button being activated to allow switching between pan and write. Again, however, at page 7, Examiner states however Hinckley teaches the pen is moved upon the display screen and for panning a screen image in response to movement of the pen upon the display screen and means for causing the processor to implement writing in response to the button being activated. Once again reference is made to column 14, lines 63 through 65. Once again, while Examiner states that these portions of Hinckley set forth the implementing of writing or panning in response to button actuation or nonactuation, careful review of column 14, lines 63 through 65 reveals this to be in error.

In Examiner's rejection of claim 9, the same erroneous interpretation of Shiraishi and Hinckley is continued again with reference to column 12, lines 47 through 56 of Hinckley. Finally at page 8 of the present office action in the material relating to Examiner's rejection of claim 10, this same incorrect reasoning is repeated.

Thus, it is believed that Examiner errs in asserting that the combination of Shiraishi and Hinckley renders Applicant's inventive system obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicant again wishes to assert that the present invention system is a pen-based computer interface system in which a vexing problem associated with prior art devices utilizing on screen writing with a pen or stylus is addressed. This vexing problem arises as the writer approaches or reaches the edge of the display screen. In the prior art devices, the writer must:

- Stop writing
- Move the pen to scroll icons
- Scroll the partially written image to provide writing space
- Return to the writing position
- Continue writing

With the advantages of the present invention system, the writer upon reaching the display edge, simply:

- Switches the mode select button to change from write to pan mode without raising the pen
- Moves the pen to create writing space
- Switches the mode select button back to write mode
- Continues writing

Applicant's claims, as amended, clearly set forth this inventive operation. Accordingly, it is believed with respect to Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Shiraishi, Applicant's claim 1 as amended clearly distinguishes Applicant's system from

Shiraishi and therefore Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

With respect to Examiner's rejection of claims 2 through 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Shiraishi in view of Hinckley, Applicant believes that Applicant's amendment of claims 1, 5 and 8 from which Applicant's claims variously depend clearly overcomes Examiner's rejections based upon the combination under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Shiraishi and Hinckley. It is believed that both references alone or in combination fail to show Applicant's inventive pen-based computer interface system for use in writing upon a display screen and for providing writing space without the need of lifting the writing pen or stylus from the display screen surface. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's rejection of Applicant's claims 2 through 10 be withdrawn and that Applicant's claims 3 through 10 (claim 2 having been canceled) be allowed and the present application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Roy A. Ekstrand
Registration No. 27,485
Attorney for the Applicant

3158 Redhill Avenue, Ste. 150
Costa Mesa, California 92626
(714)662-7733

Date: June 26, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on June 26, 2007.

By: Roy A. Ekstrand
Signature:
Date: June 26, 2007